



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/578,107	05/24/2000	Satoshi Kawase	JP9-1999-0099-US1	4769

25259 7590 04/02/2004

IBM CORPORATION  
3039 CORNWALLIS RD.  
DEPT. T81 / B503, PO BOX 12195  
REASEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709

EXAMINER

ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2143

DATE MAILED: 04/02/2004

15

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/578,107

Applicant(s)

KAWASE ET AL.

Examiner

David E. England

Art Unit

2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 3, 10 - 12, and 14 - 16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 3, 10 - 12, and 14 - 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 – 3, 10 – 12, and 14 – 16 are presented for examination.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

2. Claims 1 – 3, 10 – 12, and 14 – 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jawahar et al. U.S. Patent No. 6298356 (hereinafter Jawahar)

3. Referencing claim 1, Jawahar teaches

4. (a) receiving, at the information terminal support server, an HTTP message sent from a Web server in response to a customer-side browser request, (e.g. col. 21, lines 18 – 44, “...*client requests are re-directed through the session host...*”);

5. (b) determining whether or not said HTTP message agrees with a predetermined condition, (e.g. col. 8, lines 25 – 40, “*filter*” & col. 22, lines 4 – 30, “*conditions, filter*”);

6. (c) editing contents of said HTTP message when said HTTP message agrees with said predetermined condition, (e.g. col. 7, lines 53 – 65 & col. 13, lines 10 – 53, “*modified to include information about the customer*”);

7. (d) sending said HTTP message in an unedited form to the customer-side browser, (e.g. col. 18, line 56 – col. 19, line 2, & col. 12, lines 4 – 32); and

8. (e) sending said HTTP message in an edited form to the agent-side browser, (e.g. col. 7, lines 53 – 65 & col. 13, lines 10 – 53, “*modified to include information about the customer*”).

9. Referencing claim 2, Jawahar teaches editing is carried out to insert a command for a client program loaded on the agent-side information terminal, (e.g. col. 10, lines 1 – 18, “synchronization” & 19, lines 11 – 50, “POST”).

10. As per claim 3, as interpreted by the examiner, Jawahar teaches said command is one of “form submit prohibition”, “form alteration prohibition”, “concealment of specific form” or “concealment of specific field”, (e.g. col. 18, line 56 – col. 19, line 50, “*URL sharing may be undesirable or impossible if the customer request includes information that is not or should not be readily available to the agent. An HTTP client request includes a method or command that describes the action to be taken on the URL by the server. One such method is the POST method. The POST method enables a customer-client to communicate additional information other than the URL to the server.*”).

11. Claims 10 – 12, and 14 – 16 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

### ***Response to Arguments***

12. Applicant's request for reconsideration of the finality of the rejection of the last Office action is persuasive and, therefore, the finality of that action is withdrawn.

13. In the remarks, Applicant argues in substance that Jawahar does not teach or suggest determining whether an HTTP message sent from a web server in response to a customer-side browser request agrees with a predetermined condition and “editing contents of said http

Art Unit: 2143

message when said HTTP message agrees with said predetermined condition,” as recited in claim 1.

14. As to part 1, Examiner would first like to address the meaning of the word “edit”. While examining the claims, one must interpret the claim language in the broadest aspect of the limitations presented. The term “edit” can be interpreted as changing the form of an “object” in appearance, substance, etc. An “object” could be anything one can make, see, touch, hear, read, etc. This means that one can add and/or take away form the original object, and it would be edited. An example could be editing a book, the author could take out a page or words that don’t describe the true nature of the character and the author could add in more descriptive wording to bring out the feeling of being in the setting of a character.

15. In Jawahar, a costumer makes a request to communicate with an agent. The request it sent to a server and an agent is found to take the costumer request, (e.g. col. 12, lines 34 – 43, *“At step 176, the Java applet (running on the customer's computer) contacts the Java server and communicates the customer's request to the Java server. In this example, the customer has requested that an agent contact the customer by return telephone call. Step 178 calls the transaction host servlets (e.g., the servlets that performs the functions of transaction host 102 in FIG. 3), which locates an agent to handle the customer's request. An agent may be located by communicating with transaction processing system manager 120 to select an agent and to initiate a telephone call across the PSTN.”*). After the agent is located to handle the costumer’s request, information about the costumer is displayed to the agent about the costumer such as account information or past purchases, (e.g. col. 12, lines 44 – 64, *“(e.g. account information, or*

Art Unit: 2143

*past purchases)”), which can be interpreted as predetermined conditions, that were generated by the costumer at an earlier transaction. Various windows (known as frames) are displayed to the agent in a browser along with the page the costumer is viewing, which is imbedded into the web site that the agent is viewing, therefore the web page is edited by adding content to the original web site the costumer is viewing, (e.g. col. 13, lines 10 – 53, “FIG. 6 illustrates an embodiment of various windows (also referred to as frames) displayed to an agent using the agent's computer. An agent's computer includes a display device that provides visual information to the agent. In FIG. 6, an agent's browser application generates a display 190 containing multiple frames 192, 194, 196, 198, and 200. Frame 192 represents the web page or other information currently being displayed to the customer. Thus, the agent is able to easily determine what information is available to the customer based on frame 192. Additionally, the agent can provide additional information about a product or service while referring to the information already displayed to the customer. Frame 194 is a text chat window that allows the agent and the customer to communicate using typed information. The text chat window can be used at any time, and is particularly useful when a voice connection cannot be established between the agent and the customer (e.g., the customer does not have an Internet phone and has only one telephone line, which is used to access the Internet).”). It is very apparent that the agent is viewing a modified, “edited”, version of the web site the costumer is viewing, from the server. Keeping in mind that “edit” does not strictly mean to take away from the original object, it can mean to add to an object, as is very apparent in the reference of Jawahar. Therefore, Jawahar teaches, “receiving, at the information terminal support server, an HTTP message sent from a Web server in response to a customer-side browser request,” “determining whether or not said HTTP*

Art Unit: 2143

message agrees with a predetermined condition,” “editing contents of said HTTP message when said HTTP message agrees with said predetermined condition,” “sending said HTTP message in an unedited form to the customer-side browser,” and “sending said HTTP message in an edited form to the agent-side browser.” If the Applicant were to further limit the language of the claims to describe the term “edit(ed/ing)” to specifically be interpreted as restricting information to an agent, then it could overcome the prior art, but would require further search and consideration. Claims 10 and 14 are still rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

16. In the remarks, Applicant argues in substance that Jawahar does not teach the limitations of claims 2, 11 and 15, furthermore does not teach editing the HTTP message before sending the message to the agent-side browser.

17. As to part 2, Examiner would like to draw the Applicant’s attention to the rejection that is restated above, which teaches editing the HTTP message before sending the message to the agent-side browser. Furthermore, taking the teaches referenced in claim 1, the section stated for claim 2 states, “*Synchronization service 104 synchronizes changes between all participants in a particular communication. For example, in an agent-customer communication, any changes entered to a web page by the customer are identified by synchronization service 104, and provided to the agent's browser application. Thus, synchronization service 104 ensures that all participants in a communication are provided with the same information.*” Furthermore, a section previously disclosed above stating, (e.g. col. 13, lines 15 – 19), *Frame 192 represents the web page or other information currently being displayed to the customer. Thus, the agent is able*

Art Unit: 2143

*to easily determine what information is available to the customer based on frame 192.* This teaching along with the teachings of claim 1, since claim 2 is dependent on claim 1, discussed above, show that Jawahar does teach editing the HTTP message before sending the message to the agent-side browser. Claims 11 and 15 are still rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

18. In the remarks, Applicant argues in substance that Jawahar does not teach said command is one of "form submit prohibition", "form alteration prohibition", "concealment of specific form" or "concealment of specific field".

19. As to part 3, Examiner would like to point out that the claim language states, "said command is one of". Therefore all four commands do not have to be present in Jawahar for the claim to be rejected properly, only one command. Also, the application does not specifically disclose the function or detail of "form submit prohibition" or "form alteration prohibition", therefore leaving these limitations to be interpreted broadly. Jawahar does teach the limitations of claim 3 as stated above in the rejection, as stated, "*if a customer request includes information that is not or should not be readily available to the agent*", is just one example of one of the limitations that Jawahar teaches. Claims 12 and 16 are still rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

20. In the remarks, Applicant argues in substance that Jawahar actually teaches away from the presently claimed invention because it teaches that the customer and the agent view the same



Art Unit: 2143

Web page with the same information, as opposed to sending an HTTP message to the customer in an unedited form and sending the HTTP message to the agent in a edited form.

21. As to part 4, Examiner would like to draw the Applicant's attention to what was stated above to the interpretation of "edited". As discussed above, Jawahar teaches the costumer viewing a HTTP message and requesting an agent to aid the costumer in a specific matter. The agent is then given the web page the costumer is viewing in a frame along with other frames in the browser that has other information about the costumer and possibly a type of online chat to communicate with the costumer or other users in a network. This, along with other points stated above, does teach on the claim language and the broad interpretation of "edited", as in adding information to a HTTP request in multiple frames in a browser. If the Applicant were to be more specific about the specific interpretation of "editing", it could overcome the reference of Jawahar, but would change the scope of the invention and claim language and would require further search and consideration.

22. Applicant's arguments filed 03/05/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Claims 1 – 3, 10 – 12 and 14 – 16 are still rejected as described above.

### ***Conclusion***

23. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 703-305-5333. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is none.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is none.

David E. England  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2143

De



DAVID WILEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100